S.B.CRIMINAL MISC. BAIL APPLICATION NO.2728/2006

Date : 07.07.2006

HON'BLE MR. SATYA PRAKASH PATHAK, J.

Mr. K.S. Chouhan for the applicant.
Mr. Vishnu Kachhawaha, Public Prosecutor for State.
Mr. K.R. Bishnoi for complainant.

I have heard learned counsel for the applicants as well as the learned Public Prosecutor for the State assisted by learned counsel for the complainant and carefully gone through the impugned order.

The contention of learned counsel for the applicants is that no specific role has been assigned to the applicants and they were not responsible for snatching the money. According to him, no case under Section 382 IPC is made out against the applicants.

On the other hand, learned Public Prosecutor assisted by learned counsel for the complainant has submitted that in this case forcibly money was snatched and injury was caused on the person of the complainant by accused applicant Khet Singh, therefore, they are entitled to anticipatory bail.

After hearing learned counsel for the parties, I am of the opinion that prima facie it cannot be said that there is no

involvement of the accused applicants in the present case.

Taking into consideration the overall facts and circumstances of the present case, I do not find it to be a fit case to extend benefit of anticipatory bail to the applicants. Accordingly, the bail application moved under by the applicants under Section 438 Cr.P.C. is rejected.

(SATYA PRAKASH PATHAK), J.